

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

BRIAN THIEME, on behalf of himself)
and all others similarly situated,)

Plaintiff,)

v.)

Case No. CIV-16-209-M

CHESAPEAKE ENERGY CORP.,)
CHESAPEAKE EXPLORATION, LLC,)
as a successor by merger to)
CHESAPEAKE ENERGY)
EXPLORATION, L.P.,)
SANDRIDGE ENERGY, INC.,)
TOM L. WARD, and)
JOHN DOES 1-50,)

Defendants.)

_____)
DON BEADLES, on behalf of himself)
and all others similarly situated,)

Plaintiff,)

v.)

Case No. CIV-16-238-M

CHESAPEAKE ENERGY CORP.,)
CHESAPEAKE EXPLORATION, LLC,)
as a successor by merger to)
CHESAPEAKE ENERGY)
EXPLORATION, L.P.,)
SANDRIDGE ENERGY, INC.,)
TOM L. WARD, and)
JOHN DOES 1-50,)

Defendants.)

_____)
JANET L. LOWERY,)
on behalf of herself,)
and all others similarly situated,)

Plaintiff,)	
v.)	Case No. CIV-16-284-M
)	
CHESAPEAKE ENERGY CORP.,)	
CHESAPEAKE EXPLORATION, LLC,)	
as a successor by merger to)	
CHESAPEAKE ENERGY)	
EXPLORATION, L.P.,)	
SANDRIDGE ENERGY, INC.,)	
TOM L. WARD, and)	
JOHN DOES 1-50,)	

Defendants.

THE RUBY L. STUCKY TRUST
DATED APRIL 22, 1997,
on behalf of itself and
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.)	Case No. CIV-16-293-M
)	
CHESAPEAKE ENERGY CORP.,)	
CHESAPEAKE EXPLORATION, LLC,)	
as a successor by merger to)	
CHESAPEAKE ENERGY)	
EXPLORATION, L.P.,)	
SANDRIDGE ENERGY, INC.,)	
TOM L. WARD, and)	
JOHN DOES 1-50,)	

Defendants.

GARVIN HOLDINGS, L.L.C.,
on behalf of itself and all others similarly
situated,

Plaintiff,

v.)	Case No. CIV-16-297-M
)	
CHESAPEAKE ENERGY CORP.,)	

CHESAPEAKE EXPLORATION, LLC,)
as a successor by merger to)
CHESAPEAKE ENERGY)
EXPLORATION, L.P.,)
SANDRIDGE ENERGY, INC.,)
TOM L. WARD, and)
JOHN DOES 1-50,)
)
Defendants.)

_____)
IDA POWERS and LARRY POWERS,)
)
Plaintiffs,)

v.)

Case No. CIV-16-301-M

CHESAPEAKE ENERGY CORP.,)
CHESAPEAKE EXPLORATION, LLC,)
as a successor by merger to)
CHESAPEAKE ENERGY)
EXPLORATION, L.P.,)
SANDRIDGE ENERGY, INC.,)
TOM L. WARD, and)
JOHN DOES 1-50,)
)
Defendants.)

_____)
CURTIS L. CRANDALL and)
JANET K. CRANDALL,)
on behalf of themselves and all others)
Similarly situated,)
)
Plaintiffs,)

v.)

Case No. CIV-16-306-M

CHESAPEAKE ENERGY CORP.,)
CHESAPEAKE EXPLORATION, LLC,)
as a successor by merger to)
CHESAPEAKE ENERGY)
EXPLORATION, L.P.,)
SANDRIDGE ENERGY, INC.,)
TOM L. WARD, and)

JOHN DOES 1-50,)
)
 Defendants.)

CATHERINE JAUNITA)
 BEHRENBRINKER,)
 on behalf of herself,)
 and all others similarly situated,)
)
 Plaintiff)

v.)

Case No. CIV-16-320-M

CHESAPEAKE ENERGY CORP.,)
 CHESAPEAKE EXPLORATION, LLC,)
 as a successor by merger to)
 CHESAPEAKE ENERGY)
 EXPLORATION, L.P.,)
 SANDRIDGE ENERGY, INC.,)
 TOM L. WARD, and)
 JOHN DOES 1-50,)
)
 Defendants.)

DERRICK R. HERZOG and)
 AMY K HERZOG,)
 on behalf of themselves)
 and others similarly situated,)
)
 Plaintiffs,)

v.)

Case No. CIV-16-325-M

CHESAPEAKE ENERGY CORP.,)
 CHESAPEAKE EXPLORATION, LLC,)
 as a successor by merger to)
 CHESAPEAKE ENERGY)
 EXPLORATION, L.P.,)
 SANDRIDGE ENERGY, INC.,)
 TOM L. WARD, and)
 JOHN DOES 1-50,)
)
 Defendants.)

MICHELLE WHITE,)
on behalf of herself,)
and all others similarly situated,)

Plaintiff,)

v.)

Case No. CIV-16-351-M

CHESAPEAKE ENERGY CORP.,)
CHESAPEAKE EXPLORATION, LLC,)
as a successor by merger to)
CHESAPEAKE ENERGY)
EXPLORATION, L.P.,)
SANDRIDGE ENERGY, INC.,)
TOM L. WARD, and)
JOHN DOES 1-50,)

Defendants.)

_____)
MAHONEY-KILLIAN, INC.,)
EDWARD CLARK, INC., and)
CYNTHIA ANN SHOEPPPEL,)

Plaintiffs,)

v.)

Case No. CIV-16-358-M

CHESAPEAKE ENERGY CORP.,)
CHESAPEAKE EXPLORATION, LLC,)
as a successor by merger to)
CHESAPEAKE ENERGY)
EXPLORATION, L.P.,)
SANDRIDGE ENERGY, INC.,)
TOM L. WARD, and)
JOHN DOES 1-50,)

Defendants.)

_____)

ORDER

Before the Court is the plaintiffs' Agreed Motion to Consolidate, filed March 31, 2016. On April 7, 2016, defendants filed their Notice of Non-Opposition to Plaintiffs' Agreed Motion to Consolidate, advising the Court that defendants agree that consolidation of the above referenced cases, as well as other pending cases in this Court, involving common questions of law and fact, is appropriate.¹ Upon review of plaintiffs' unopposed motion, and for good case cause shown, the Court GRANTS plaintiffs' Agreed Motion to Consolidate [docket no. 26] and ORDERS the following:


1. The above actions are hereby CONSOLIDATED, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42, with *Thieme v. Chesapeake Energy Corp. et al.*, Case No. CIV-16-209-M.
2. The following actions are hereby ADMINISTRATIVELY CLOSED: (1) *Beadles v. Chesapeake Energy Corp. et al.*, Case No. CIV-16-238-M; (2) *Lowery v. Chesapeake Energy Corp. et al.*, Case No. CIV-16-284-M; (3) *Garvin Holdings, L.L.C. v. Chesapeake Energy Corp. et al.*, Case No. CIV-16-297-M; (4) *The Ruby L. Stucky Trust Dated April 22, 1997 v. Chesapeake Energy Corp., et al.*, Case No. CIV-16-293-M; (5) *Powers v. Chesapeake Energy Corp., et al.*, Case No. CIV-16-301-M; (6) *Crandall v. Chesapeake Energy Corp., et al.*, Case No. CIV-16-306-M; (7) *Behrenbrinker v. Chesapeake Energy Corp., et al.*, Case No. CIV-16-320-M; (8) *Herzog v. Chesapeake Energy Corp., et al.*, Case No. CIV-16-325-M; (9) *White v. Chesapeake Energy Corp., et al.*, Case No. CIV-16-351-M; and *Mahoney-Killian, Inc. v. Chesapeake Energy Corp., et al.*, Case No. CIV-16-358-M.
3. This matter will be hereafter referred to as "In re Anadarko Basin Oil and Gas Lease Antitrust Litigation" ("Consolidated Action").
4. Subsequent filings in the Consolidated Action will bear the following caption:
IN RE ANADARKO BASIN OIL AND) Case No. CIV-16-209-M
GAS LEASE ANTITRUST LITIGATION).

¹ Plaintiffs further advise that defendants agree that filing a single consolidated complaint and a new caption is appropriate.

5. Plaintiffs will file a single consolidated complaint in the Consolidated Action within forty-five (45) days of the date of this Order. That complaint will supersede any earlier-filed complaints in any of the consolidated cases.²
6. Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, this Order shall apply to any action designated as related at the time of filing, transfer, or removal.

The parties in the above-captioned cases, and parties in any subsequently consolidated cases, may move to consolidate other cases that they believe involve a common question of law or fact. Upon a finding of good cause, such cases will be consolidated with the above-captioned cases.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 15th day of April, 2016.


VICKI MILES-LAGRANGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

² Pursuant to the Court's April 1, 2016 Order extending defendants' time to answer, defendants shall file their answer, or responsive pleading, to plaintiffs' consolidated complaint within sixty (60) days of the consolidated complaint being filed. *See* docket no. 30, Case No. CIV-16-209-M.